

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Applicants have received the Final Office Action dated February 9, 2007 (herein after "Office Action"), in which the Examiner rejected claims 5 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by Yamauchi et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,047,103, hereinafter "Yamauchi"). With this Response, Applicants have amended claim 5, canceled claim 7, and added claims 8-16. Based upon the amendments and arguments presented below, Applicants believe all claims to be in condition for allowance.

Applicants respectfully note that Yamauchi teaches determining how to process the data read from the storage medium based upon the data type ("...a judgment section for judging whether or not the digital data is video information based on the data attribute flag... ." Yamauchi, col. 7, lines 18-20). Yamauchi does not teach "header data specifying that a drive reading the data storage medium is permitted to send the sector data in an unencrypted form to the requestor if the one or more control bits equal a first value," as required by independent claim 5, as amended. Yamauchi teaches converting digital data into video data, and as noted by the Examiner, "such conversion does not imply encryption." Office Action, p. 3, ¶ 2. Yamauchi does not teach or even suggest permitting the data stored on the storage medium to be sent specifically in either encrypted or unencrypted form based upon the value of one or more control bits stored in a sector header of the storage medium. Yamauchi instead teaches sending data judged to be non-video data without any limitation, or data judged to be video data with some limitations, regardless of whether the video data is or is not encrypted, either when read or when output.

Further, independent claim 5, as amended, also requires that the control bits "determine whether the sector data is sent to a requestor *regardless of the type of data stored in the sector*" (emphasis added). Applicants note that Applicants' disclosure makes no characterizations of the type of data stored on the storage medium, referring to "data" throughout the disclosure in generic terms. Thus, the processing of the data described in the disclosure applies to *any* data on the storage medium, and is not restricted to a particular type of data, such as

video data. All that is required by the claims is “header data specifying that a drive reading the data storage medium is permitted to *send the sector data in an unencrypted form* to the requestor if the one or more control bits equal a first value” (emphasis added). Yamauchi does not teach or even suggest providing data specifically in unencrypted form based on the value of one or more control bits independent of the type of data stored. For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 5, and all claims that depend upon it, are in condition for allowance.

Applicants further note that Independent claim 7 has been cancelled, and the subject matter of said claim incorporated into at least some of the new dependent claims added. Also, Applicants have added method claims 12-16, which are similar in scope to claims 5 and 8-11. For at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 5 and 8-11, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 12 and those claims that depend upon it are also in condition for allowance.

### **CONCLUSION**


In the course of the foregoing discussions, Applicants may have at times referred to claim limitations in shorthand fashion, or may have focused on a particular claim element. This discussion should not be interpreted to mean that the other limitations can be ignored or dismissed. The claims must be viewed as a whole, and each limitation of the claims must be considered when determining the patentability of the claims. Moreover, it should be understood that there may be other distinctions between the claims and the cited art which have yet to be raised, but which may be raised in the future.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. It is believed that no extensions of time or fees are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required (including

**Appl. No. 10/632,756**  
**Prelim. Amdt. dated April 4, 2007**  
**Reply to Final Office Action of February 9, 2007**

fees for net addition of claims) are hereby authorized to be charged to Hewlett-Packard Development Company's Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Roberto de Leon", is written over a horizontal line.

Roberto de Leon  
PTO Reg. No. 58,967  
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.  
(713) 238-8000 (Phone)  
(713) 238-8008 (Fax)  
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY  
Intellectual Property Administration  
Legal Dept., M/S 35  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400